



Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool: ALE GSS FY2023- NM

Program: ACEP

Pool Status: Active

States: NM (Admin)

Template: ACEP-ALE GSS (Program Agreements)

Template Status: Active

Last Modified By: Athena Cholas

Last Modified: 11/16/2022

Land Uses and Modifiers

| Land Use | Grazed | Wildlife | Irrigated | Hayed | Drained | Organic | Water Feature | Protected | Urban | Aquaculture |
|--------------------|--------|----------|-----------|-------|---------|---------|---------------|-----------|-------|-------------|
| Forest | -- | -- | -- | N/A | N/A | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Range | -- | -- | N/A | -- | N/A | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Pasture | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Farmstead | -- | -- | -- | N/A | N/A | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Developed Land | N/A | -- | -- | N/A | N/A | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Water | N/A | -- | N/A | N/A | N/A | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Other Rural Land | -- | -- | -- | N/A | N/A | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Associated Ag Land | -- | -- | -- | -- | N/A | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

Resource Concern Categories

| Categories | | | |
|--|-------|-----------|-------|
| Category | Min % | Default % | Max % |
| Concentrated erosion | 0 | 5 | 20 |
| Degraded plant condition | 5 | 10 | 50 |
| Field pesticide loss | 0 | -- | 20 |
| Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss | 0 | 5 | 50 |
| Livestock production limitation | 5 | 10 | 50 |
| Long term protection of land | 35 | 45 | 75 |
| Pest pressure | 0 | 5 | 40 |
| Salt losses to water | 0 | -- | 20 |
| Soil quality limitations | 0 | -- | 45 |
| Source water depletion | 0 | 5 | 40 |
| Storage and handling of pollutants | 0 | -- | 25 |
| Terrestrial habitat | 0 | 10 | 40 |

Categories

| Category | Min % | Default % | Max % |
|------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Wind and water erosion | 0 | 5 | 10 |

Concentrated erosion

| Resource Concern | Min % | Default % | Max % |
|--|-------|-----------|-------|
| Bank erosion from streams, shorelines or water conveyance channels | 0 | -- | 100 |
| Classic gully erosion | 0 | 100 | 100 |
| Ephemeral gully erosion | 0 | -- | 100 |

Degraded plant condition

| Resource Concern | Min % | Default % | Max % |
|---------------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Plant productivity and health | 0 | 50 | 100 |
| Plant structure and composition | 0 | 50 | 100 |

Field pesticide loss

| Resource Concern | Min % | Default % | Max % |
|---|-------|-----------|-------|
| Pesticides transported to groundwater | 0 | 50 | 100 |
| Pesticides transported to surface water | 0 | 50 | 100 |

Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss

| Resource Concern | Min % | Default % | Max % |
|---|-------|-----------|-------|
| Nutrients transported to groundwater | 0 | 20 | 100 |
| Nutrients transported to surface water | 0 | 20 | 100 |
| Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids or compost applications transported to groundwater | 0 | 20 | 100 |
| Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids or compost applications transported to surface water | 0 | 20 | 100 |
| Sediment transported to surface water | 0 | 20 | 100 |

Livestock production limitation

| Resource Concern | Min % | Default % | Max % |
|---|-------|-----------|-------|
| Feed and forage balance | 0 | 60 | 100 |
| Inadequate livestock shelter | 0 | -- | 100 |
| Inadequate livestock water quantity, quality and distribution | 0 | 40 | 100 |

Long term protection of land

| Resource Concern | Min % | Default % | Max % |
|----------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Threat of conversion | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Pest pressure

| Resource Concern | Min % | Default % | Max % |
|---------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Plant pest pressure | 0 | 100 | 100 |

Salt losses to water

| Resource Concern | Min % | Default % | Max % |
|------------------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Salts transported to groundwater | 0 | 50 | 100 |
| Salts transported to surface water | 0 | 50 | 100 |

Soil quality limitations

| Resource Concern | Min % | Default % | Max % |
|---|-------|-----------|-------|
| Aggregate instability | 0 | 15 | 100 |
| Compaction | 0 | 15 | 100 |
| Concentration of salts or other chemicals | 0 | 15 | 100 |
| Organic matter depletion | 0 | 20 | 100 |
| Soil organism habitat loss or degradation | 0 | 20 | 100 |
| Subsidence | 0 | 15 | 100 |

Source water depletion

| Resource Concern | Min % | Default % | Max % |
|----------------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Groundwater depletion | 0 | 35 | 100 |
| Inefficient irrigation water use | 0 | 35 | 100 |
| Surface water depletion | 0 | 30 | 100 |

Storage and handling of pollutants

| Resource Concern | Min % | Default % | Max % |
|---|-------|-----------|-------|
| Nutrients transported to groundwater | 0 | 20 | 100 |
| Nutrients transported to surface water | 0 | 20 | 100 |
| Petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants transported to groundwater | 0 | 30 | 100 |
| Petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants transported to surface water | 0 | 30 | 100 |

Terrestrial habitat

| Resource Concern | Min % | Default % | Max % |
|--|-------|-----------|-------|
| Terrestrial habitat for wildlife and invertebrates | 0 | 100 | 100 |

Wind and water erosion

| Resource Concern | Min % | Default % | Max % |
|------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Sheet and rill erosion | 0 | 50 | 100 |

Wind and water erosion

| Resource Concern | Min % | Default % | Max % |
|------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Wind erosion | 0 | 50 | 100 |

Practices

| Practice Name | Practice Code | Practice Type |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| Acquisition Process - Buy-Protect-Sell Transfer | LTAPBPST | Easements |
| Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search | LTAPERS | Easements |
| Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search Update | LTAPERSU | Easements |
| Acquisition Process - Ingress Egress | LTAPIE | Easements |
| Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review First Review | LTAPTR1 | Easements |
| Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review Second Review | LTAPTR2 | Easements |
| Long-Term Protection of Land - Permanent Easement | LTPPE | Easements |

Ranking Weights

| Factors | Algorithm | Allowable Min | Default | Allowable Max |
|--------------------------|-----------|---------------|---------|---------------|
| Vulnerabilities | Default | 5 | 5 | 20 |
| Planned Practice Effects | Default | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Resource Priorities | Default | 35 | 50 | 50 |
| Program Priorities | Default | 40 | 40 | 50 |
| Efficiencies | Default | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Display Group: ALE-GSS FY2023- NM (Active)

 An asterisk will be displayed to show that it is a conditional section or conditional question.

Survey: Applicability Questions

| Section: New Mexico ALE | | |
|---|----------------|--------|
| Question | Answer Choices | Points |
| Is the majority of the land being entered in ALE program agreement located in New Mexico? | YES | -- |
| | NO | -- |

Survey: Category Questions

| Section: Program agreements | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Question | Answer Choices | Points |

Section: Program agreements

| Question | Answer Choices | Points |
|--|----------------|--------|
| Has the entity requested a program agreement for this application? | YES | -- |
| | NO | -- |

Survey: Program Questions

Section: National program questions

| Question | Answer Choices | Points |
|--|-----------------------|--------|
| What is the percent of prime, unique, and important farmland soils in the parcel to be protected as shown in Web Soil Survey? | more than 20% | 15 |
| | 10-20% | 11 |
| | 5-9% | 7 |
| | 2-4% | 3 |
| | Less than 2% | 0 |
| What is the percent of cropland, rangeland, grassland, historic grassland, pastureland, and nonindustrial private forest land in parcel to be protected? | 97-100% | 30 |
| | 93-96% | 26 |
| | 90-93% | 22 |
| | 80-89% | 18 |
| | Less than 80% | 0 |
| What is the ratio of the total acres of land in the parcel to be protected to average farm size in the county according to the most recent USDA Census of Agriculture? USDA NASS - 2017 Census, State Report, Table 8, https://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/AgCensus/2017/Online_Resources/County_Profiles/New_Mexico/index.php | more than 1 | 10 |
| | 0.8- 1.0 | 8 |
| | 0.5-0.79 | 6 |
| | Less than 0.5 | 0 |
| What is the decrease in the percentage of acreage of farm and ranch land in the county in which the parcel is located between the last two USDA Censuses of Agriculture? (USDA - NASS - 2017 Census of Agriculture, State report Table 8)? | 10% or more decrease | 30 |
| | 8.0-9.9% decrease | 25 |
| | 6.0-7.9% decrease | 20 |
| | 4.0-5.9% decrease | 15 |
| | Less than 4% decrease | 0 |
| What is the decrease in the percentage of acreage of permanent grassland, pasture, and rangeland, other than cropland and woodland pasture, in the county in which the parcel is located between the last two USDA Censuses of Agriculture.(USDA - NASS - 2017 Census of Agriculture, State report Table 8)? | 20% or more decrease | 15 |
| | 10-19.9% decrease | 10 |
| | 0-9.9% decrease | 5 |
| | No decrease | 0 |
| What is the percent population growth in the county as documented by the U.S. Census (Census Bureau Home Page)? | More than 4% | 10 |
| | 2-4% | 8 |
| | 0-1.9% | 6 |
| | Negative growth | 0 |

Section: National program questions

| Question | Answer Choices | Points |
|--|---|--------|
| What is the population density (population per square mile) as documented by the 2010 U.S. Census (Census Bureau Home Page)? | More than 100 | 20 |
| | 70-99 | 15 |
| | 40-69 | 10 |
| | 10-39 | 5 |
| | less than 10 | 0 |
| Is there a written farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan established to address agricultural viability for future generations? | Yes, written by industry professional | 8 |
| | Yes, in place for at least 3 years | 6 |
| | Yes, in place at time of application. | 4 |
| | No written plan | 0 |
| What is the distance of the parcel to other protected land, such as compatible military installations; land owned in fee title by the United States or an Indian Tribe, State or local government, or by a nongovernmental organization whose purpose is to protect agricultural use and related conservation values; or land that is already subject to an easement or deed restriction that limits the conversion of the land to nonagricultural use or protects grazing uses and related conservation values? | Adjacent | 40 |
| | Up to 3 miles | 30 |
| | 3 to 5 miles | 20 |
| | more than 5 and up to 10 miles | 10 |
| | more than 10 miles | 0 |
| What is the distance of the parcel to other agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure? | Adjacent on two or more sides | 5 |
| | Adjacent on one side | 3 |
| | Within one mile | 1 |
| | Farther than one mile | 0 |
| How does the parcel maximize the protection of contiguous or proximal acres devoted to agricultural use? | The parcel is located between two already protected agricultural lands that are no more than 5 miles from the parcel. | 5 |
| | The parcel is adjacent to agricultural land in an area zoned for agriculture. | 2 |
| | The parcel is in an area not zoned for agriculture or without any special agricultural designation. | 0 |
| Does the parcel contain land currently enrolled in CRP in a contract that is set to expire within one year and is grassland that would benefit from protection under a long-term easement or is land under a CRP contract that is in transition to a covered farmer or rancher pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 3835(f) ? | YES | 5 |
| | NO | 0 |
| What percent of the non-federal share of the agricultural land easement is from the eligible entity own cash resources for payment of easement purchase and procured costs? | At least 15% of easement FMV is from entity cash resources used for purchase or procured costs | 4 |
| | At least 10% of easement FMV is from entity cash resources | 3 |
| | At least 5% is from entity cash resources | 2 |
| | Less than 5% is from entity cash resources | 0 |
| Does the parcel contain grassland of special environmental significance that would benefit from protection under a long-term easement? | YES | 3 |
| | NO | 0 |

Survey: Resource Questions

| Section: State criteria | | |
|---|--|--------|
| Question | Answer Choices | Points |
| Does the parcel contain riparian habitat or perennial streams? | YES | 100 |
| | NO | 0 |
| Are landowners considered historically underserved such as socially disadvantaged, limited resource landowner, new or beginning farmer/rancher or veteran farmer/rancher? | All owners | 25 |
| | At least one owner, if owned by more than one person or there is more than one member of an entity | 10 |
| | None of the owners | 0 |
| Is the parcel located in proximity to the Rio Grande River, Pecos River, Gila River, Canadian River or San Juan River? | Within or up to one mile away | 75 |
| | more than one and up to 5 miles away | 55 |
| | more than 5 and up to 7 miles away | 35 |
| | more than 7 and up to 15 miles away | 25 |
| | More than 15 miles away | 0 |